A U M

Do not believe from trust in traditions even if these have been held in honor for many generations and in many places. —*Kalama Sutta*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLIV **January, 1956** **No. 3**

MAN AND NATURE

THE difficulty with "resolutions," and New Year's resolutions in particular, is the feeling of artificiality or even a bit of posturing which seems to go with them. A man easily becomes of two minds about New Year's resolutions. First, there is the moral suasion in the air that he *ought* to make them. Yet an almost automatic response of the free individual to any kind of suasion—even moral suasion—is resistance. Nevertheless, the suspicion remains that there is room for improvement in his life, and an improvement is supposed to start with some kind of resolution.

The main problem, then, is to remove the pressure of tradition from the idea of making resolutions. This seems to be necessary if we are to get at the meaning behind them, and to begin to *want* to take advantage of that meaning, regardless of pious admonition. As a matter of fact, there is something "second-hand" about doing anything because one "ought" to, according to someone else's idea. It may be better to do the thing for this reason than not to do it at all, but why not have a good reason instead of a poor one?

In Theosophical teachings, resolutions are connected with the doctrine of cycles. A resolution undertaken at the proper time is a kind of cooperation with the law of periodicity. And since resolutions which affect human behavior are almost inevitably related to the control of the psychic nature, the cycles which are important for resolutions are likely to have an effect on the psychic nature.

The psychic nature may be variously defined, for a variety of purposes, but one definition seems undeniably accurate: the psychic nature

is that collection of plastic intelligences associated as a system which comprises the "feelings" of individual humans. The disciple's longing for constancy in devotion is nothing more than a perpetual contest with the inconstancy of the feelings. It is the feelings, alas, which shape our motives, and when feelings change, so do motives. In the grip of anger, irritation, or envy, a man's sense of brotherhood diminishes to a pale memory. The words which yesterday inspired are now void of meaning, but empty syllables. Another strength possesses the mind, directing its reflections with a monopolist's fervor.

The wholeness of the passion produces its own logic of vindication, spreading throughout the psychic nature as water saturates a sponge. Psychic polarity permits no schisms or minor revolts. The law of unity will have its way, even for partisan ends.

As psychic beings, we are one, two, half a dozen different persons. Multiple personality is no case-book wonder, but the common human lot. It must be by reason of the vast power and numerous resources of the psychic nature that the counsel of the wise is always in behalf of discovering and cleaving to that lonely and separate identity which is above all psychic inclinations—the self which is untouched by emotional storms and wanderings. For this is the self through which a man is free.

There are hours, we are told, and sometimes fortunately learn from experience, when that self assumes command. These are times of dispassionate perception, of egoic revery. They are not the moments when we seem to stride to glory, but rather intervals when we feel no need to go any place at all. They bring a motionless content with past, present, and future. They do not, cannot, last, but sometimes extend the quiet of their serenity into the day ahead. Here, perhaps, is something of what is meant in the books by the "paralysis" of the personal nature.

The snow which blankets some parts of the earth during the making of the new year must surely represent this passage of psychic neutrality in the life of the plant. Winter is a time of the exhaustion of natural tides. It brings a loss of color, but also a kind of catharsis to make possible a new beginning. In any season of birth, some things will begin again, while others will not, or need not, be renewed. Nature, in the oncoming spring, will again be filled with the seeds of life, but not all seeds are viable. Some will die. Some will die from lack of nourishment, others from being displaced. What is a seed? A tiny center of memory, a hidden spring of latent action. By June, the hillside or

the field will be a riot of green, shading into the soft brown of twigs and branches. The earth's irregular floor becomes tufted with the bursting intentions of seeds which feel the summer ahead. It is all a vast competition of life, glorying in its undirected splendor. How different the garden, with its disciplined rows, its ordered purpose and promise of harvest. Yet there is beauty in both.

The analogy is useful, but not altogether successful. It is easy to plant and weed a garden. Its homely virtues mock the maker of high resolves. What we want is some kind of magic to transform the landscape of the psychic life, not a humble annual that will wilt in the summer sun. But even a little retrospect will show that the seeds of psychic polarity are not without a magic of their own. A burning preoccupation with something we *must* do, or *must* have—whether a thing or a way about doing something Important—can be as binding to some greater matter as actual absence of sight. And for lack of seeing, a whole forest of feelings maintain their validity unchallenged by a wider perspective. So pass the days and years, the feelings closing about our lives to shape the sense of completeness, defining both necessity and obligation, and even outlining the application of ethical responsibility, as much by what is not seen as what is seen.

It is not so much that we have to resolve to *see* as that the suzerainty of psychic polarity be renounced. The best opposition to the misrule of psychic impulse is the rule of regularity in actions which have another origin. To be regular in small things, which, taken together, are not small at all, fosters the growth of independent mind. So simple a thing as coming regularly to meetings, as giving thoughtful attention in meetings, as watching and contributing to the course of a meeting, may join the mind with habits of deliberate action. It is a principle that is at issue here, and not a talent, nor even a spiritual perception. An action taken on principle is beyond degree or measure of excellence. It is the highest thing. And it is a thing of which all men are capable. The thing done may be simple, it may seem unimportant, but, seen in its place, there is nothing more that any man can do.

The visible fruits of a life of principle, or the persistent pursuit of principle, may be long in coming. But like the best things in life, they are worth waiting for. Yet, paradoxically, they never come to one who *waits* for them. The unsought growth is the strongest, just as the resolves which do not have to be "made," but which only confirm a stance already taken in the heart, are the most likely to be kept.

MEDITATION, CONCENTRATION, WILL

[William Q. Judge maintained throughout his life an intimate contact with the small nucleus of students who carried on the work of the Theosophical Movement in the land of his birth—ancient Erin. In October, 1892, the first number of the *Irish Theosophist* appeared in Dublin. The founders of this magazine included D. N. Dunlop, W. B. Yeats, G. W. Russell (Æ), Charles Johnston, and Claude Falls Wright—all men of capacity and lasting influence. Mr. Judge found time to contribute one article to the *Irish Theosophist* during its first year of publication—his invaluable "Meditation, Concentration, Will"—which was printed in the July, 1893, number, and is now reprinted for the third time in THEOSOPHY. Following, are two other short articles by Mr. Judge, both relating to "Meditation, Concentration, Will."—Editors.]

THESE three, meditation, concentration, will, have engaged the attention of Theosophists perhaps more than any other three subjects. A canvass of opinions would probably show that the majority of our reading and thinking members would rather hear these subjects discussed and read definite directions about them than any others in the entire field. They say they must meditate, they declare a wish for concentration, they would like a powerful will, and they sigh for strict directions, readable by the most foolish theosophist. It is a western cry for curriculum, a course, a staked path, a line and rule by inches and links. Yet the path has long been outlined and described, so that anyone could read the directions whose mind has not been half-ruined by modern false education, and memory rotted by the superficial methods of a superficial literature and a wholly vain modern life.

Let us divide Meditation into two sorts. First is the meditation practiced at a set time, or an occasional one, whether by design or from physiological idiosyncracy. Second is the meditation of an entire life-time, that single thread of intention, intentness, and desire running through the years stretching between the cradle and the grave. For the first in Patanjali's Aphorisms will be found all needful rules and particularity. If these are studied and not forgotten, then practice must give results. How many of those who reiterate the call for instruction on this head have read that book, only to turn it down and never again consider it? Far too many.

The mysterious subtle thread of a life meditation is that which is practiced every hour by philosopher, mystic, saint, criminal, artist, artisan, and merchant. It is pursued in respect to that on which the heart is set; it rarely languishes; at times the meditating one greedily running after money, fame, and power looks up briefly and sighs for a better life during a brief interval, but the passing flash of a dollar or a sovereign recalls him to his modern senses, and the old meditation begins again. Since all theosophists are here in the social whirl I refer to, they can every one take these words to themselves as they please. Very certainly, if their life meditation is fixed low down near the ground, the results flowing to them from it will be strong, very lasting, and related to the low level on which they work. Their semi-occasional meditations will give precisely semi-occasional results in the long string of recurring births.

"But, then," says another, "what of concentration? We must have it. We wish it; we lack it." Is it a piece of goods that you can buy it, do you think, or something that will come to you just for the wishing? Hardly. In the way we divide meditation into two great sorts, so we can divide concentration. One is the use of an already acquired power on a fixed occasion, the other the deep and constant practice of a power that has been made a possession. Concentration is not memory, since the latter is known to act without our concentrating on anything, and we know that centuries ago the old thinkers very justly called memory a phantasy. But by reason of a peculiarity of the human mind the associative part of memory is waked up the very instant concentration is attempted. It is this that makes students weary and at last drives them away from the pursuit of concentration. A man sits down to concentrate on the highest idea he can formulate, and like a flash troops of recollections of all sorts of affairs, old thoughts and impressions come before his mind, driving away the great object he first selected, and concentration is at an end.

This trouble is only to be corrected by practice, by assiduity, by continuance. No strange and complicated directions are needed. All we have to do is to try and to keep on trying.

The subject of the Will has not been treated of much in theosophical works, old or new. Patanjali does not go into it at all. It seems to be inferred by him through his aphorisms. Will is universal, and belongs to not only man and animals, but also to every other natural kingdom. The good and bad man alike have will, the child and the aged, the

wise and the lunatic. It is therefore a power devoid in itself of moral quality. That quality must be added by man.

So the truth must be that will acts according to desire, or, as the older thinkers used to put it, "behind will stands desire." This is why the child, the savage, the lunatic, and the wicked man so often exhibit a stronger will than others. The wicked man has intensified his desires, and with that his will. The lunatic has but few desires, and draws all his will force into these; the savage is free from convention, from the various ideas, laws, rules, and suppositions to which the civilized person is subject, and has nothing to distract his will. So to make our will strong we must have fewer desires. Let those be high, pure, and altruistic; they will give us strong will.

No mere practice will develop will *per se,* for it exists forever, fully developed in itself. But practice will develop in us the power to call on that will which is ours. Will and Desire lie at the doors of Meditation and Concentration. If we desire truth with the same intensity that we had formerly wished for success, money, or gratification, we will speedily acquire meditation and possess concentration. If we do all our acts, small and great, every moment, for the sake of the whole human race, as representing the Supreme Self, then every cell and fibre of the body and inner man will be turned in one direction, resulting in perfect concentration. This is expressed in the New Testament in the statement that if the eye is single the whole body will be full of light, and in the Bhagavad Gita it is still more clearly and comprehensively given through the different chapters. In one it is beautifully put as the lighting up in us of the Supreme One, who then becomes visible. Let us meditate on that which is in us as the Highest Self, concentrate upon it, and will to work for it as dwelling in every human heart.

THE FRUITS OF MEDITATION

The most beautiful and most profound emotion we can experience is the sensation of the mystical. It is the sower of all true science. He to whom this emotion is a stranger, who can no longer wonder and stand rapt in awe, is as good as dead. To know that what is impenetrable to us really exists, manifesting itself as the highest wisdom and the most radiant beauty which our dull faculties can comprehend only in their primitive forms—this knowledge, this feeling is at the center of true religiousness.

—EINSTEIN

THE THREE PLANES OF HUMAN LIFE

JAGRATA, SWAPNA, SUSHUPTI: WAKING, DREAMING, DREAMLESS SLEEP

I SPEAK of ordinary men. The Adept, the Master, the Yogi, the Mahatma, the Buddha, each lives in more than three states while incarnated upon this world, and they are fully conscious of them all, while the ordinary man is only conscious of the first—the waking-life, as the word conscious is now understood.

Every theosophist who is in earnest ought to know the importance of these three states, and especially how essential it is that one should not lose in Swapna the memory of experiences in Sushupti, nor in Jagrata those of Swapna, and *vice versâ*.

Jagrata, our waking state, is the one in which we must be regenerated; where we must come to a full consciousness of the Self within, for in no other is salvation possible.

When a man dies he goes either to the Supreme Condition from which no return against his will is possible, or to other states—heaven, hell, avitchi, devachan, what not—from which return to incarnation is inevitable. But he cannot go to the Supreme State unless he has perfected and regenerated himself; unless the wonderful and shining heights on which the Masters stand have been reached while he is in a body. This consummation, so devoutly desired, cannot be secured unless at some period in his evolution the being takes the steps that lead to the final attainment. These steps can and must be taken. In the very first is contained the possibilty of the last, for causes once put in motion eternally produce their natural results.

Among those steps are an acquaintance with and understanding of the three states first spoken of.

Jagrata acts on Swapna, producing dreams and suggestions, and either disturbs the instructions that come down from the higher state or aids the person through waking calmness and concentration which tend to lessen the distortions of the mental experiences of dream life. Swapna again in its turn acts on the waking state (Jagrata) by the good or bad suggestions made to him in dreams. All experience and all religions are full of proofs of this. In the fabled Garden of Eden

---

NOTE.—This article, a natural companion study to Mr. Judge's "Meditation, Concentration, Will," first appeared in the *Path* for August, 1888, and was last printed in THEOSOPHY 29: 463.

the wily serpent whispered in the ear of the sleeping mortal to the end that when awake he should violate the command. In Job it is said that God instructeth man in sleep, in dreams, and in visions of the night. And the common introspective and dream life of the most ordinary people needs no proof. Many cases are within my knowledge where the man was led to commit acts against which his better nature rebelled, the suggestion for the act coming to him in dream. It was because the unholy state of his waking thoughts infected his dreams, and laid him open to evil influences. By natural action and reaction he poisoned both Jagrata and Swapna.

It is therefore our duty to purify and keep clear these two planes.

The third state common to all is *Sushupti,* which has been translated *"dreamless sleep."* The translation is inadequate, for, while it is dreamless, it is also a state in which even criminals commune through the higher nature with spiritual beings and enter into the spiritual plane. It is the great spiritual reservoir by means of which the tremendous momentum toward evil living is held in check. And because it is involuntary with them, it is constantly salutary in its effect.

In order to understand the subject better, it is well to consider a little in detail what happens when one falls asleep, has dreams, and then enters Sushupti. As his outer senses are dulled the brain begins to throw up images, the reproductions of waking acts and thoughts, and soon he is asleep. He has then entered a plane of experience which is as real as that just quitted, only that it is of a different sort. We may roughly divide this from the waking life by an imaginary partition on the one side, and from Sushupti by another partition on the other. In this region he wanders until he begins to rise beyond it into the higher. There no disturbances come from the brain action, and the being is a partaker to the extent his nature permits of the "banquet of the gods." But he has to return to waking state, and he can get back by no other road than the one he came upon, for, as Sushupti extends in every direction and Swapna under it also in every direction, there is no possibility of emerging at once from Sushupti into Jagrata. And this is true even though on returning no memory of any dream is retained.

Now the ordinary non-concentrated man, by reason of the want of focus due to multitudinous and confused thought, has put his Swapna field or state into confusion, and in passing through it the useful and elevating experiences of Sushupti become mixed up and distorted, not resulting in the benefit to him as a waking person which is his right

as well as his duty to have. Here again is seen the lasting effect, either prejudicial or the opposite, of the conduct and thoughts when awake.

So it appears, then, that what he should try to accomplish is such a clearing up and vivification of Swapna state as shall result in removing the confusion and distortion existing there, in order that upon emerging into waking life he may retain a wider and brighter memory of what occurred in Sushupti. This is done by an increase of concentration upon high thoughts, upon noble purposes, upon all that is best and most spiritual in him while awake. The best result cannot be accomplished in a week or a year, perhaps not in a life, but, once begun, it will lead to the perfection of spiritual cultivation in some incarnation hereafter.

By this course a center of attraction is set up in him while awake, and to that all his energies flow, so that it may be figured to ourselves as a focus in the waking man. To this focal point—looking at it from that plane—converge the rays from the whole waking man toward Swapna, carrying him into dream-state with greater clearness. By reaction this creates another focus in Swapna, through which he can emerge into Sushupti in a collected condition. Returning he goes by means of these points through Swapna, and there, the confusion being lessened, he enters into his usual waking state the possessor, to some extent at least, of the benefits and knowledge of Sushupti. The difference between the man who is not concentrated and the one who is, consists in this that the first passes from one state to the other through the imaginary partitions postulated above, just as sand does through a sieve, while the concentrated man passes from one to the other similarly to water through a pipe or the rays of the sun through a lens. In the first case each stream of sand is a different experience, a different set of confused and irregular thoughts, whereas the collected man goes and returns the owner of regular and clear experience.

These thoughts are not intended to be exhaustive, but so far as they go it is believed they are correct. The subject is one of enormous extent as well as great importance, and theosophists are urged to purify, elevate, and concentrate the thoughts and acts of their waking hours so that they shall not continually and aimlessly, night after night and day succeeding day, go into and return from these natural and wisely appointed states, no wiser, no better able to help their fellow men. For by this way, as by the spider's small thread, we may gain the free space of spiritual life.

PROOFS OF THE HIDDEN SELF

Through Dreams

THE dream state is common to all people. Some persons say they never dream, but upon examination it will be found they have had one or two dreams and that they meant only to say their dreams were few. It is doubtful whether the person exists who never has had a dream. But it is said that dreams are not of importance; that they are due to blood pressure, or to indigestion, or to disease, or to various causes. They are supposed to be unimportant because, looking at them from the utilitarian view-point, no great use is seen to follow. Yet there are many who always make use of their dreams, and history, both secular and religious, is not without records of benefit, of warning, of instruction from the dream. The well-known case of Pharaoh's dream of lean and fat kine which enabled Joseph as interpreter to foresee and provide against a famine represents a class of dream not at all uncommon. But the utilitarian view is only one of many.

Dreams show conclusively that although the body and brain are asleep—for sleep begins primarily in the brain and is governed by it —there is still active a recollector and perceiver who watches the introspective experience of dreaming. Sorrow, joy, fear, anger, ambition, love, hate, and all possible emotions are felt and perceived in dreams. The utility of this on the waking plane has nothing to do with the fact of perception. Time all is measured therein, not according to solar division but in respect to the effect produced upon the dreamer. And as the counting of this time is done at a vastly quicker rate than is possible for the brain, it follows that some person is counting. In all these dreams there is a recollection of the events perceived, and the memory of it is carried into the waking state. Reason and all the powers of intelligent waking man are used in dreams; and as emotion, reasoning, perception, and memory are all found to be even more active in dreams than in waking life, it must follow that the Hidden Self is the one who has and does all this.

The fanciful portion of dreams does not invalidate the position. Fancy is not peculiar to dreaming; it is also present in waking con-

---

NOTE.—This article by William Q. Judge was first printed in the *Path* for August, 1894, and last printed in THEOSOPHY for December, 1941.

sciousness. In many people fancy is quite as usual and vivid as with any dreamer. And we know that children have a strong development of fancy. Its presence in dream simply means that the thinker, being liberated temporarily from the body and the set forms or grooves of the brain, expands that ordinary faculty. But passing beyond fancy we have the fact that dreams have prophecy of events not yet come. This could not be unless there exists the inner Hidden Self who sees plainly the future and the past in an ever present.

In Clairvoyance

Waking clairvoyance cannot now be denied. Students of Theosophy know it to be a faculty of man, and in America its prevalence is such as to call for no great proof. There is the clairvoyance of events past, of those to come, and of those taking place.

To perceive events that have taken place in which the clairvoyant had no part nor was informed about, means that some other instrument than the brain is used. This must be the Hidden Self. Seeing and reporting events that subsequently transpire gives the same conclusion. If the brain is the mind, it must have had a part in a past event which it now reports, either as actor or as hearer from another who was present, but as in the cases cited it had no such connection as actor, then it follows that it has received the report from some other perceiver. This other one is the Hidden Self, because the true clairvoyant case excludes any report by an eye-witness.

Then again, when the clairvoyant is dealing with an event presently proceeding at a distance, it is necessary that a perceiver who recollects must be present in order to make report. For the brain and its organs of sight and hearing are too far off. But as the clairvoyant does report correctly what is going on, it is the other Hidden Self who sees the event, bridges the gap between it and the brain, and impresses the picture upon the bodily organs.

The Feeling of Identity

If recollection is the basis for the feeling of identity continuous throughout life, and if brain is the only instrument for perception, then there is an inexplicable series of gaps to be accounted for or bridged over, but admitting the Hidden Self no gaps exist.

We are born feeling that we are ourself, without a name, but using a name for convenience later on. We reply to challenge by saying "It

is I"—the name following only for convenience to the other person. This personal identity remains although we fall asleep each night and thus far become unconscious. And we know that even when a long period is blotted out of memory by fall, blow, or other accidental injury, the same feeling of identity crosses that gap and continues the same identical "I" to where memory again acts. And although years of life with all their multiplicity of events and experience have passed, leaving but a small amount of recollection, we yet know ourselves as that unnamed person who came to life so many years before. We do not remember our birth nor our naming, and if we are but a bundle of material experience, a mere product of brain and recollection, then we should have no identity but constant confusion. The contrary being the case, and continuous personal identity being felt and perceived, the inevitable conclusion is that we are the Hidden Self and that Self is above and beyond both body and brain.

THE SOUL'S OPINIONS

The first and highest purity is that which is in the soul; and we say the same of impurity. Now you could not discover the impurity of the soul as you could discover that of the body; but as to the soul, what else could you find in it than that which makes it filthy in respect to the acts which are her own? Now the acts of the soul are movement toward an object or movement from it, desire, aversion, preparation, design, assent. What then is it in these acts which makes the soul filthy and impure? Nothing else than her own bad judgment. Consequently the impurity of the soul is the soul's bad opinions; and the purification of the soul is the planting in it of proper opinions; and the soul is pure which has proper opinions, for the soul alone in her own acts is free from perturbation and pollution.

—EPICTETUS

NOTES ON THE DHAMMAPADA

AMONG all Eastern scriptures and philosophical treatises "the teachings of the compassionate Buddha" lay best claim to speaking universal language. One need not be versed in the strictures of formal logic, nor conversant with the details of a special metaphysic, in order to discuss and explore the rich meaning of Buddha's statements and metaphors. In group discussions of the *Dhammapada,* even today, everyone, without exception, discovers something interesting to say, while the student who reads the *Dhammapada* in solitude will soon discover how many productive trains of thought can be prompted by a single verse or phrase.

Most of us intuitively believe that the greatest truths may be briefly stated, that profundity and simplicity should, in final synthesis, go hand in hand; it comes as no surprise, then, for Theosophists to find that H.P.B. twice speaks of Buddha as belonging to "the Sixth Round" of human evolution—a commentary on his capacity to communicate to men of all intellectual degrees. Never entangled by abstruse webs of terminology, Buddha knew how to unveil philosophical mysteries by the use of such images as even percipient children can understand.

In *Isis Unveiled,* H.P.B. explains why Buddhism may be regarded as the touchstone for evaluation of other religions, remarking that

> Buddhism as taught in its primitive purity, and carried to perfection by the last of the Buddhas, Gautama, based its moral ethics on three fundamental principles. It alleged that 1, every thing existing, exists from natural causes; 2, that virtue brings its own reward, and vice and sin their own punishment; and 3, that the state of man in this world is probationary. We might add that on these three principles rested the universal foundation of every religious creed; God, and individual immortality for every man—if he could but win it. However puzzling the subsequent theological tenets; however seemingly incomprehensible the metaphysical abstractions which have convulsed the theology of every one of the great religions of mankind as soon as it was placed on a sure footing, the above is found to be the essence of every religious philosophy, with the exception of later Christianity. It was that of Zoroaster, of Pythagoras, of Plato, of Jesus, and even of Moses, albeit the teachings of the Jewish law-giver have been so piously tampered with.

Buddha's three principles are distilled in the *Dhammapada* into a method of psychological examination. The Buddhist "reform" was

irresistible because even the slightest understanding of Buddha's psychology inspired men to ask questions about themselves, and to go on asking them. It is, then, as psychology—and particularly as a method of psychological inquiry—that Buddhism is to be considered in this series. Many doctrinal theosophical teachings are pure metaphysics, and their study and examination play a considerable role in the mental life of the Theosophist. Yet those teachings, to reveal themselves fully, must be approached from the standpoint of psychology, logic and ethics. In Buddha's own day, these were the weapons the great universal teacher brought to bear in freeing men from superstition and priestly control. Madame Blavatsky quotes Max Müller in this characterization: "The reform of Buddha had originally much more of a social than of a religious character. The most important element of Buddhist reform has always been its social and moral code, not its metaphysical theories. *That moral code is one of the most perfect which the world has ever known* . . . and he whose meditations had been how to deliver the soul of man from misery and the fear of death, had delivered the people of India from a degrading thraldom and from priestly tyranny."

So, at the outset, it is well to probe the nature of that great dynamic of Buddhist inspiration which has led, again and again, to rediscovery of Buddha's profundity. Today interest in Buddhism is once more in ascent, marked by two new editions of the *Dhammapada* this year, and by the special interest of leading psychologists in the applicability of Buddha's principles and perspective to the psychic disturbances of the day. (Two articles appearing in Lookout during the past year may serve as amplification—June and November 1955 issues.)

Madame Blavatsky once described the *Dhammapada* as being "the most extraordinary and interesting of all the original manuscripts that have been translated from the various languages in which Buddhism is expounded." There is no better illustration of the rewards to be gained by meditating on a single passage of the *Dhammapada* than that afforded by the first sentence: "All that we are is the result of what we have thought: all that we are is founded on our thoughts and formed of our thoughts." This is the story of man, not of only individual man, but of Anthropogenesis, the history of the Races and Rounds of planetary evolution, and, if "all that we are" includes the physical structure of our corporeal instruments, the implication is that Cosmogenesis, also, originates in a state, quality and condition of mind. The first two verses of the *Dhammapada* ask a man to examine the proposition that

all evil, pain and suffering are directly traceable to his own state of mind. Next, lest concern with his responsibility for the production of evil and pain overwhelm him, the converse is pointed out—that happiness, too, grows inevitably from certain conditions of mind. Here, as elsewhere throughout the *Dhammapada,* Buddha says that if a man speaks or acts purely "Happiness pursues him like his own shadow that never leaves him," thus paying his respects to the ideal of happiness.

The next two verses of Chapter One take the first great step in Buddha's logic, by examination of that greatest of all evils, hostility. *If* "all that we are is founded on our thoughts and formed of our thoughts," those who indulge feelings of hatred towards others who have apparently abused them *will partake of the nature of hatred,* attract themselves to hatred, and suffer the consequences in "both this world and the next." Those who root out all feelings of hostility, on the other hand, Buddha says, "rejoice in both, rejoice exceedingly," and they are free to feel the purity, the goodness and the love of life. The man of hatred constantly laments, while the man who has conquered hatred is "happy here, happy hereafter."

Christ taught the way of love as the antidote to hatred, but Buddha's psychological emphasis is different. He does not ask man to "love his neighbor," but merely asks him to comprehend the fact that he builds his own happiness or unhappiness with every thought he thinks and each word he utters. Love of neighbor, performance of one's duty, these are to flow naturally from man's conviction of his own integrity and responsibility. Buddha, therefore, approaches ethics chiefly by induction, preaches, not goodness nor virtue in and of itself, but simply the need for self-understanding. When Buddha remarks that "rains pour into an ill-thatched house; desires pour into an ill-trained mind," he is not attacking vagrant desires, but pointing out that desires uncontrolled leave men devitalized—"him verily doth Mara uproot as a gale a weak tree," continuing that "whoso lives disciplining himself, unmindful of pleasures, his senses restrained, moderate in eating, full of faith and dauntless energy (*Virya*)—him verily Mara doth not overturn as a gale doth not overturn a rocky mountain."

The imagery is effective, leading one to see that Buddha's conception of the "good" life is one of dauntless energy, vitality, joy in the role of one who will, in time, become a Buddha in his own right.

Chapter Two continues the sequence, being entitled "Vigilance" and explaining the need for guarding against the ways of indifference. "The wise," Buddha says "value vigilance as their best treasure. The wise distinctly understand that vigilance is the path to Life Eternal. Therefore they delight in wakeful watching, ever strenuous in endeavour." One attains the tranquility of the Sage, then, "the highest freedom and happiness," through strength gained by daily *affirmation* in living.

In this chapter, also, Buddha relates the attainment of "great joy" to perseverance in meditation. At this point one finds definitive clarification on the difference between Buddha's teaching and the Christian tradition. For in Christianity the emphasis has always been upon prayer rather than reflection. One becomes virtuous by enlisting God's help in warding off the evils of temptation. Meditation, on the other hand, is the means by which the disciple comes to understand the nature of good and evil, and—equally important—develops the stamina needed for ruling desires with a firm hand. Meditation, according to Buddha, is "strenuous endeavor," a continuous practicing of "vigilance." One attains positive happiness by positive means, in preference to attaining the negative tranquility afforded by a life wherein no positive "sins" have been committed. The disciple is not, at the outset, given a list of commandments he must not break, but rather taught the logic of the unfoldment of his own higher self. The object is "the terrace of wisdom," and wisdom can never be prideful. The weak and the unwise are not to be despised nor chastised. For when man has ascended "the terrace of wisdom, sorrowless he surveys the sorrowful crowd. This wise man regards the foolish as the mountaineer from his higher peak looks at those who are dwelling on the plains."

Is not this passage worth daily contemplation? The wise man has not retired from the world, nor does he seek to impose his own way of life upon others. With the thrill of a mountaineer who has scaled the highest peak, he breathes pure air—and the implication is that only the man who has reached this place and state is truly able to be a teacher of his fellows. If a reformer, he must bring the atmosphere of the highest elevation with him onto the plains, and not become involved in the success or failure of efforts to change the lives of other men. He is without direct self-interest in the workings of the world, and so he can be unfaltering in his compassion, truly understanding of "the sorrowful crowd."

It is for all these reasons that we find the eminent scholar and statesman, Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, saying in his *Indian Philosophy* that "Buddha wished to steer clear of profitless metaphysical discussions. Buddhism is essentially psychology, logic and ethics." He continues:

> Buddha, like Lucretius, felt that the world would be better for the triumph of natural law over supernaturalism. By announcing a religion which proclaimed that each man could gain salvation for himself without the mediation of priests or reference to gods, he would increase the respect for human nature and raise the tone of morality. After Buddha did his work, the belief in the permanence and universality of natural law became almost an instinct of the Indian mind. The world of experience according to Buddha does not require for its explanation any God. The law of karma will do. There is the implication of the existence of the Highest, but it is not a matter of logical demonstration..

A Nontheistic Religion

Buddhism is markedly different in important respects from Christianity, Judaism, Mohammedanism, or any of the other religions about which the majority of probable readers of this book are likely to know much. Yet, in respect to nobility of teachings, capacity to bring peace of soul to its devotees, and to foster good will and peace among men, it easily ranks with any of these religions and perhaps surpasses some of them. Again, considering the number of its adherents, Buddhism is one of the major religions of mankind. In India, where it originated, it is still the religion of some of the Northern tribes. It is the common religion in Ceylon, Nepal, Burma, Thailand, Indochina. In China, more than half the population are reckoned as Buddhists. Buddhism reached Korea, and from there Japan, where it is widespread although it is no longer the established religion there. In the form of Lamaism, it is the religion of Thibet. It is the religion of the Mongolian tribes of central Asia, and reaches to the very north of Siberia and even into Lapland. Altogether, some 500 million persons regard themselves as Buddhists. And, much to the credit of Buddhism, "its transplanting to new lands has been accomplished never though conquest or through migration but solely by the spread of ideas."

—C. J. Ducasse

THE ANATHEMAS AGAINST ORIGEN

V

FEW present-day minds, perhaps, even among the most profound of theological students, are intellectually qualified to penetrate the subtleties of early Christian metaphysics. Even a cursory survey of the anathemas against Origen gives clear indication that the religion of some of the early Church Fathers was both philosophical and complex, and that in addition to its accepted Jewish heritage, it possessed strong elements of both Greek and Oriental cosmogony in its terminology and teaching. Terms such as God, Christ, Logos, Nous, the Trinity, Seraph, Cherub, etc., etc., carried shades of meaning not even suspected by the average Western scholar, but a knowledge of which was held by the ancients to be absolutely necessary for religious understanding.

Anathemas No. VI through IX contain references to many of the metaphysical terms enumerated above, *i.e.,* to the Logos, Nous, the Monad, etc., thus pointing clearly to the philosophical character of Origen's teachings. How is one to account for the general ignorance among religious thinkers of this day with respect to God, Man and Nature? Might it be due to the fact that none of the present-day teachings of theology contain clear and concise statements of the many-sided relationships and differences, the fine distinctions of being-hood, that must necessarily exist between these metaphysical forces of Nature?

Christianity, evidently, has ceased to be a *philosophy.* In its place have arisen numerous stereotyped creeds and sects, preaching dogmas fit only for minds that are content to believe in literal symbolism. Oriental metaphysics, on the other hand, as also the elaborate system of the Greeks, remain philosophical from beginning to end, possessing clarifying concepts not only of the nature and character of the invisible "gods and angels," but also of their duties and functions on the invisible side of Nature. Real Kosmos, says *The Secret Doctrine,* is invisible. The phenomena of the material universe are but the effects of causes set in motion by intelligent beings behind the veil of matter. It is the loss, no doubt, of this true pantheistic spirit that has transformed so much of modern thinking into a cold materialism.

It would be a task too difficult, and perhaps too dull, for most inquirers to go into lengthy philosophical definitions of the terms found in the Anathemas against Origen. It is enough to say that such definitions *do* exist in the nomenclature of Theosophy, recourse to which is open to anyone interested in the subject. (See *Secret Doctrine* Index.)

It may be worth-while, however, to consider briefly the idea of *creation* as set forth in Anathema No. VI, together with comparative statements from theosophical teachings:

> If anyone shall say . . . that the world which has in itself elements more ancient than itself, and which exist by themselves, *viz*: dryness, damp, heat and cold, and the image to which it was formed, was so formed, and that the most holy and consubstantial Trinity did not create the world, but that it was created by the working intelligence which is more ancient than the world, and which communicates to it its being: let him be anathema.

The Secret Doctrine admits of no *personal* God, or Creator, of the Universe.

> It admits a Logos or a collective "Creator" of the Universe; a *Demiurgos*—in the sense implied when one speaks of an "Architect" as the "Creator" of an edifice, whereas that Architect has never touched one stone of it, but, while furnishing the plan, left all the manual labour to the masons; in our case the plan was furnished by the Ideation of the Universe, and the constructive labour was left to the Hosts of intelligent Powers and Forces. But that *Demiurgos* is no *personal* deity,—*i.e.,* an imperfect *extra-cosmic god,*—but only the aggregate of the Dhyan-Chohans and the other forces." (*S.D.* I, 279-80.)
>
> The active Power, the "Perpetual motion of the great Breath" only awakens (not creates) Kosmos at the dawn of every new period. . . . Everything that *is, was,* and *will be,* eternally IS, even the countless forms, which are finite and perishable only in their objective, not in their *ideal* Form . . . Neither the form of man, nor that of any animal, plant or stone has ever been *created,* and it is only on this plane of ours that it commenced "becoming," *i.e.,* objectivising into its present materiality, or expanding *from within outwards,* from the most sublimated and supersensuous essence into its grossest appearance. (*S.D.* I, 282.)

All the elements of which the universe is composed, then, existed in germ before physical nature condensed, "the image to which it was formed" being likewise pre-existent in Universal Mind.

Anathema No. VII depicts the age-old teaching of the journey of the Monad through the kingdoms of Nature, as well as through all forms of life upon this planet. The theosophical teachings of Buddhism touch upon the numberless incarnations of the Buddha, before he was born as Gautama, referring to the same doctrine. The Buddha, representing in this case the Monad, begins a series of incarnations in the lowest forms of life upon the globe, striving ever upward through all classes and degrees of intelligence, and emerging finally into the body of a perfected Man. From this teaching has come the idea underlying every religious concept of the Saviour, or Divine Incarnation. See what Anathema No. VII has to say on this tenet:

> If anyone shall say that . . . to restore them (all those who had fallen) he (Christ) passed through diverse classes, had different bodies and different names, became all to all, an Angel among Angels, a Power among Powers, had clothed himself in the different classes of reasonable beings with a form corresponding to that class, and finally has taken flesh and blood like ours and is become man for man. . . . let him be anathema.

No impartial student of comparative religions will fail to see in this journey a passage of "the Christ" through the various classes of being, an identity of teaching with that of the five thousand *Jatakas* (the events of former incarnations) of the Buddha, by way of the Cycle of Necessity as depicted in the Third Fundamental Proposition of The Secret Doctrine. This is the "obligatory pilgrimage" for the Divine Soul through every form of the external universe, as well as through all the varying degrees of intelligence. Buddhaship or Christhood, which is the goal of every pilgrim-Soul, implies the experience and assimilation of every degree of knowledge, as of every feeling of joy and sorrow:

> If anyone says or thinks that at the resurrection, human bodies will rise in spherical form and unlike our present form, let him be anathema. (Justinian's Anathema, No. V.)

The ancient Greeks, according to *The Ocean of Theosophy,* held that the form of man was once globular or spherical in shape. This was at a time prior to the consolidation of the physical universe, when the human race lived in a state of matter more ethereal than the present gross substance. It is held by Oriental metaphysics that every human Ego possesses an invisible form which lasts throughout the period of a Great Cycle, or Manvantara. After each earthly incarnation, at the

time of death, and when the physical body has been discarded, the immortal soul, they say, rises invisibly into higher regions, in its permanent ethereal form. Such, says Origen, "shall be the bodies of all after the resurrection," whereupon "the nature of their bodies (physical) shall be annihilated."

Anathemas Nos. XII and XIII show forth the substance of Origen's teaching with respect to the unity of all life. The tragedy of latter-day Christianity is the hard and fast division it has made between good and evil, the separation of God from the devil. No. XII reads:

> If anyone shall say that the heavenly Powers and all men and the Devil and evil spirits are united with the Word of God in all respects, as the NOUS which is by them called Christ and which is in the form of God, let him be anathema.

While No. XIII holds that

> If anyone shall say that the Christ (*i.e.,* the NOUS) is in no wise different from other reasonable beings, neither substantially nor by wisdom nor by his power and might over all things but that all will be placed at the right hand of God, as well as he that is called by them Christ (the NOUS), as also they were in the feigned pre-existence of all things: let him be anathema.

The ancient Latin phrase, *Demon est Deus inversus* implies that one cannot properly make a separation between spirit and matter, between God and Devil, or between Christ and Satan. All are identical in essential nature, in any true doctrine of universal brotherhood. It may be pleasant for pious bigots to visualize *themselves* at the right hand of the Father in Heaven, while their less fortunate brothers suffer the pangs of eternal damnation, but a more pernicious doctrine has never been conceived by the human mind. The point is that this view was *utterly unknown to early philosophical Christianity.*

The difference between a Christ and a sinner is a difference in degree, not in kind. The lowest of creatures, according to Esoteric Philosophy, contains in himself all the potentialities of the whole. Is this not implied in the teachings of Jesus, where He says:

> Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? (I Cor. 3:16)
>
> Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. (Matt. 5:48)

In closing this study, it will be worth-while to compare the "noble" sentiments of Justinian's Anathema No. IX with those expressed by Krishna in the *Bhagavad-Gita.* Justinian declared:

> If anyone says or thinks that the punishment of demons and of impious men is only temporary, and will one day have an end, and that a restoration will take place of demons and of impious men, let him be anathema.

Fortunately, the curses of the Holy Church, even though sanctioned and upheld by the civil law of Justinian, are not enough to upset the Laws of Nature instituted from all eternity, nor to condemn protesters and unbelievers to bottomless pits of fire and brimstone. Among the numberless rituals, dogmas, and ceremonies borrowed from Paganism, the Church, says H. P. Blavatsky, "can claim but one invention as thoroughly original with her—namely, the doctrine of eternal damnation, and one custom, that of the anathema."

Thinking human beings, if only they *would* think, would ever be moved by conscience, and by the force of their awakened sense of justice, to repudiate both these inventions. In the meantime, the impersonal Law of Karma, unmoved either by curse or by dogmatism, will continue to serve those who work with it, and to lead on even the "sinner" to the far-away heights of perfection.

> Even if thou wert the greatest of all sinners, thou shalt be able to cross over all sins in the bark of spiritual knowledge.
>
> —*Bhagavad-Gita*

TRUE REVELATION

There was a striking naturalness, a profound propriety, in the obscurities of secrecy and awe with which the ancient Mysteries shrouded from a rash curiosity their instructions concerning the future life and only unfolded them by careful degrees to the prepared candidate. It is so with the reality itself in the nature of things.

Revelation is not to receive an announcement; it is to perceive a truth. Since God is infinite, we cannot stand out against him and talk with him. Souls in finer and fuller harmony with the works and laws of God, thus fulfilling the human condition of inspiration, are met by the divine conditions, and obtain new insight of the ways and designs of God. They experience purer and richer ideas and emotions than others, and may afterwards impart them to others, thus transmitting the revelation to them. . . . This new enlightenment is what alone constitutes a true revelation.

—WILLIAM R. ALGER

BEST OF ALL WORLDS

Of all the gifts the gods can give,
Not to be born is best of all!
—ARISTOPHANES

THE mysteries of Life and Death have been fathomed but by the great master-minds of antiquity. If, however, the sages have preserved them in secrecy and silence through long ages, it is because these problems formed part of the sacred mysteries, and again, because they must have remained incomprehensible to the vast majority of men then, as they do now. Life is at best a heartless play, a stormy sea to cross, and a heavy burden often too difficult to bear. The greatest philosophers have tried in vain to fathom and find out its *raison d'être,* and have all failed except the Eastern sages, who had the key to it.

This is the Kali Yuga, the black age, which reigns now supreme in India, and seems to coincide with that of the Western age. It is an age "black with horrors." In the esoteric philosophy of Northern Buddhism our Earth (Myalba), is called *Hell* for those who reincarnate into it for punishment. The same philosophy teaches the doctrine of the 12 great Causes of Misery (Nidanas) which bring the universes and each being periodically back into life. The 12 Nidanas are said to belong to the theory of the stream of catenated law which produced merit and demerit, and finally brings Karma into full sway. It is based on the great truth that reincarnation is to be dreaded, as existence in this world only entails upon man suffering, misery, and pain; Death itself being unable to deliver man from it, since death is merely the door through which he passes to another life on earth after a little rest on its threshold —Devachan.

A conviction has been entertained by the hermetic philosophers of all periods that, at the beginning, and before the Fall, mankind communed freely with the now unseen universes. But since that time matter has become the formidable barrier between us and the world of spirits. The first races of men were spiritual, created with all the faculties of the Deity, and powers far transcending those of the angelic host, for they were the direct emanations of the *Heavenly Man.* Present humanity is several degrees removed from even the earthly "Adam," who was

---

NOTE.—Collated from Theosophical sources.

the microcosm, or "the little world." Only when every particle of matter, even the most sublimated, has been cast off from the last shape that forms the ultimate link of that chain of double evolution—which, throughout millions of ages and successive transformations, has pushed the entity onward; and when it shall find itself reclothed in that primordial essence, identical with that of its Creator, then this once impalpable organic atom will have run its race, and the sons of God will once more "shout for joy" at the return of the pilgrim.

There would be no *life* possible without *Death,* nor regeneration and reconstruction without destruction. The *Bhagavata* speaks of a kind of destruction called Nitya Pralaya or constant dissolution, and explains it as the change which takes place imperceptibly in everything in this universe from the globe down to the atom—without cessation. It is growth and decay—life and death. "What, in truth," exclaims the poet, "is *earth* but one immense ruin, or heap of ruins, a land of death and desolation, a desert strewn with the fragments of an extinct past? If we contemplate external nature we find in its stupendous mountain chains, its gigantic volcanic peaks, shooting up aloof into the sky—its abrupt masses of scarped rock and table-lands, its scattered, solitary, gigantic stones, far from their parent mountains; its tremendous clefts, and chasms, and valleys, the evidence and traces of immense convulsions in past ages. The whole earth appears a vast assemblage of sublime ruins. When we consult more closely the materials which form these ruins, we find with astonishment that they too are composed of other ruins; we find everywhere the marks of an extinct world. A gigantic vegetation of consummate beauty in its forms; broken fragments, too, of a creation of living creatures, colossal in size, wonderful in structure, and awful in power, surround us everywhere. The dead faces of extinct organizations look out on us from stone on every side with their sad, eternal beauty; and, as every fresh sun dawns upon the world of ruins, a mournful plaint is wailed forth from all past creations to greet his rising, which recalls to them their own former being!"

Yet life can arise only out of death. Plants would perish in eternal sunlight, and so would man, who would become an automaton without the exercise of his free will and aspirations after the sunlight, which would lose its being and value for him had he nothing but light. Good is infinite and eternal only in the eternally concealed from us, and this is why we imagine it eternal. On the manifested planes, one equilibrates the other—good and evil, life and death. Man was intended

from the first to be a being of both a progressive and retrogressive nature. Beginning at the apex of the divine cycle, he gradually began receding from the center of light, acquiring at every new and lower sphere of being a more solid form and losing a portion of his *divine* faculties. Even on this earth of material degradation—in which the divine spark (Soul, a corruscation of the Spirit), was to begin its physical progression in a series of imprisonments from a stone up to a man's body—if he but exercise his WILL and call his deity to his help, man can transcend the powers of the angel. But let us look at man himself as he appears today, long posterior to his "Fall." Is "life" to be found in his dwelling? From the cradle to the cemetery where his body is laid upon the pyre, is not his course one long cry of suffering, and sorrow, and terror—one long reminiscence and foretaste not of divine life but of death?

"Oh tragic man! *whence* all this death in thy life? Is it because an inward moral death reigns throughout all, that it must have this outward manifestation also? The festivity of man is the signal of death to the humbler creatures of the earth: he rejoices, or weds, and they die as the materials of his joy, victims immolated to his household gods. Other creatures, on whose flesh he perhaps does not feed, he harasses to death by more protracted and painful means. The horse, that in his youth bore him in the day of battle or the more pompous ceremonial, is, when age advances, and his fire abates, consigned to the merciless Vaishya (trader). The dog, the honest friend of man and the hieroglyph of domestic life—what becomes of him? Into what by-way of solitude, what hole and corner does he creep, led by a mournful instinct of nature to conceal the agony of yielding up the breath? How many tragedies of animal life daily take place not far from the dwelling of man he knows not of, or knowing, lays it not to heart, or laughs to scorn of sympathy for animal suffering!"

To the superficial observer, nature is no better than an immense slaughter house wherein butchers become victims, and victims executioners in their turn. But this is true only so far as regards external physical nature. The Occultists who regard physical nature as a bundle of the most varied illusions on the plane of deceptive perceptions; who recognize in every pain and suffering but the necessary pangs of incessant procreation, a series of stages toward an ever-growing perfectibility, which is visible in the silent influence of never-erring Karma, or *abstract nature*—take a quite different view. Their motto is: "Woe to

those who live *without* suffering. Stagnation and decay is the future of all that vegetates without a change." And how can there be any change for the better without proportionate suffering during the preceding stage? Is it not those, who have learnt the deceptive values of earthly hopes and the illusive allurements of external nature, who are destined to solve the great problems of life, pain, and death?

Disease haunts man from his birth. Go into the great city: in the street there passes you the funeral procession with its lugubrious flowers, its mournful rolling undulatus. "In every house there is a cry of grief —an old man expiring; a child struggling; a strong man agonized; a woman weeping. And, as if the terrible avenger Yama had not imposed on humanity a sufficient measure of suffering and death, man goes forth himself in gold and plumes and gay caparisons—to crush out the limbs, and dash out the brains, and pierce the heart and bowels of his fellowmen. And on the battlefield are left horrible sights, terrible cries, and fearful smells of death." This is the fruit of the Kali Yuga erring mortals have brought upon themselves. Men's souls are dead when they are born: this life is an autopsy, and death is triumphant—death, physical and moral. "The dead bring forth the dead; the dead bear the dead to the funeral pyre; the dead walk about the streets and greet each other, and bargain and buy and sell, and marry, and build—and know not all the time that they are but ghosts and phantasms!"

The tiger and the donkey, the hawk and the dove, are each one as pure and as innocent as the other, because *irresponsible.* Each follows its instinct. Not so with man. In the Hindu scriptures, a soul when it quits its mortal frame, repairs to its abode in the lower regions (Kamaloka or Hades). Once there, the Recorder, or Karmic messenger reads out of his account from the Great Register, where during the life of the human being every deed and thought are indelibly impressed, and, according to the sentence pronounced, the "soul" either ascends to the abode of the Pitris (Devachan), descends to a "hell" (Kamaloka), or is reborn on earth in another human form. The student of esoteric philosophy will easily recognize the bearings of the allegories.

No deed, not even a sinful thought, will go unpunished, the latter even more severely than the former, as a thought is far more potential in creating evil results than even a deed. But crimes and sins committed on a plane of objectivity and in a world of matter, cannot receive punishment in a world of pure subjectivity. We believe in no hell or paradise as localities, in no objective hell-fires that never die.

The only *Hell* is life on this Earth. Almost every individual life is, in its full development, a sorrow. Are we to believe that poor, helpless man, after being tossed about like a piece of rotten timber on the angry billows of life, is, if he proves too weak to resist them, to be punished by a *sempiternity* of damnation, or even a temporary punishment? Never. It is at the moment of rebirth, a rebirth selected and prepared by this mysterious, inexorable, infallible LAW, that the sins of the previous life of the Ego are punished. This is exactitude of justice, it is punishment enough. That to which the refreshed and renewed "soul" returns upon this Earth, in this age, is described by the writer of Vishnu Purana when foretelling some of the dark influences and sins of the Kali Yuga:

"There will be contemporary monarchs, reigning over the earth—kings of churlish spirit, violent temper, and ever addicted to falsehood and wickedness. They will inflict death on women, children, and cows; they will seize upon the property of their subjects, and be intent upon the wives of others. They will be of unlimited power, their lives will be short, their desires insatiable . . . People of various countries intermingling with them, will follow their example; and the barbarians being powerful (in India) in their patronage of the princes, while purer tribes are neglected, the people will perish.

"Wealth and piety will decrease until the world will be wholly depraved. Property will alone confer rank; wealth will be the only source of devotion; passion will be the sole bond of union between the sexes; falsehood will be the only means of success in litigation; and women will be objects merely of sensual gratification. . . . External types will be the only distinction of the several orders of life; . . . a man if rich will be reputed pure; dishonesty (anyana) will be the universal means of subsistence; weakness the cause of dependence; menace and presumption will be substituted for learning; liberality will be devotion; mutual assent, marriage; fine clothes, dignity. He who is the strongest will reign; the people, unable to bear the heavy burden, *Khara Bhara* (the load of taxes) will take refuge among the valleys. . . . Thus, in the Kali age will decay constantly proceed, until the human race approaches its annihilation (pralaya) . . . ."

At which time, according the *The Secret Doctrine,* at the end of the Kali Yuga, 427,000 years hence, will appear the tenth avatar of Vishnu, the Kalki-Avatar—"for the final destruction of the wicked, the renovation of 'creation,' and the 'restoration of purity'."

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

IT is stated in The Key to Theosophy *that the complete truth can be found only in the combined views of all religions. Is Theosophy to be regarded as a whole truth?*

(*a*) It should always be remembered that in attempting to understand what Madame Blavatsky set down, we have to be concerned with the world of ideas in general and attitudes of other minds. Mankind, as well as individual man, develops in stages of awareness; he lives in a certain frame of mind until he has learned what he can from that position, then goes on to another dimension of understanding, always adding something to his present storehouse of knowledge.

For something to be true, it must include all that we can comprehend, and then some. It encompasses every phase of life, and is thus "completely" true. If this is so, then the truth can be approached from many different directions. For instance, when a new situation comes to us when we are young, we look at and deal with it with the eyes of the young and inexperienced. Then as we grow older, if that same or similiar situation comes to us again, we consider it all over again in relation to the material we have gathered since the previous encounter —and have a new try at the problem. Truth is always here, but it is a matter of how close we come to it, how we approach it, from what angle we see it, and how deeply we penetrate to the real.

Now, when someone is trying to present a new idea to a young person, he strives to use language that will be understood by the young and comprehended by him, yet which will at the same time encourage him to stretch his imagination toward the level of more complex thinking. In many cases, symbols of one sort or another are used. Many teachers of old, finding people of childlike nature and understanding amongst them, used such means and methods as being most beneficial to those around. Each time, a teacher has to deal with whatever he has before him; so that sometimes he will use one method of approach, sometimes another.

Haven't we all found that we desire a particular person's opinions on some matter because we know that he approaches it from a some-

what different viewpoint than our own? Is it not valuable to have many acquaintances of differing opinions, rather than be in a group where just one approach is taken, where no one is ever questioned, and the mind becomes inflexible and stale? Unless we see as many different alternatives as possible, how will we know our motive or reason for choosing a certain belief or course of action? When H.P.B. came on the scene, she said that this was the first time such a complete approach had been made, connecting science, theology, and metaphysics. Theosophy is complete in that there is no field of study or thought that is left unconsidered or tabu. Another thing that might be said is that Theosophy grows in our understanding as we grow. Theosophy does not change, but *we* do; and we gradually see things about an attitude presented in Theosophy or a doctrine that we had not seen previously. So our understanding of Theosophy is *not* complete, being limited to whatever emphasis we are giving it at the time, yet it might all be there "in Theosophy."

(*b*) In answering this question we first have to know what is meant by "a whole truth." We may *assume* that Theosophy is the truth, but to actually *know* for ourselves that it is so, we have to test these doctrines thoroughly in many ways. For instance, in a certain situation we should try to apply a certain idea or theory that we feel is true, and learn from that experience in order to get the full value of the situation that confronts us. When we do that, it becomes a part of us, or becomes "knowledge."

Of course, there are teachings, like reincarnation, which we cannot test within one lifetime. So we accept it in our reasoning mind as a truth, because we have a strong feeling within us that it "*must*" be true; and by having confidence and faith in reincarnation, we may advance and learn things in life, aided by the feeling of hope which arises when we consider reincarnation.

There can be only one Truth, otherwise it would not *be* truth. One could almost say: So many individuals, so many views of Truth. This may seem a paradox, but to get to Truth, each human being has to find the truth—which is really within him—in his own way. So, as each one of us is different because each one is "on another step of the great ladder of evolution," he sees reality from his own particular angle.

Theosophy teaches that the full truth is never completely lost, but is always re-presented to humanity differently, according to the nature of certain cycles along the ages—sometimes in symbolism. That is

why we find so many different kinds of religions; yet if this were not done, there would not be any religion or religions at all.

Theosophy is not another new kind of religion: Theosophy *is* the essence, or, as H.P.B. states in *The Key to Theosophy,* the combined views of all religions. Therefore we can go even further, and say that Theosophy is simply another name for Truth.

To what extent is the cultivation of physical courage through athletics—play involving some risk—directly related to the development of moral courage?

In the theosophical teachings it is said over and over again that it is very important to overcome dominance by matter and the senses, and to operate more in the sphere of spirit. Everyone knows by personal experience that this task is a very difficult one and requires a great deal of effort and self-discipline. Being still attached to worldly pleasures because we are living in a material world, and gaining but glimpses of the higher life, we are pulled first by one rope and then by the other. It is in this "in-between" state where self-discipline of any sort contributes. If one can obtain it directly through the channels of the mind and will-power, it can be said to be the fastest, and maybe the best, way. But if this is not yet possible, there are other means which help show the way. Here, physical courage through athletics may find its place. By cultivating athletic activities, a certain amount of discipline is manifestly required.

By training the physical body, a habit of discipline *as such* is formed, which, as a consequence, may later help one attain discipline in the spiritual life. Therefore a cultivation of physical courage through athletics can be spoken of as directly related to the development of moral courage.

The closest relation I can see of physical courage developing into or stimulating moral courage would be contingent on the individual's ability to see that the principle behind both types is the same. This, however, almost requires a philosopher, for it involves a certain amount of introspection and reasoning. By using correspondence and analogy, one can readily see that the gaining of competence in either physical or moral fields requires a certain amount of objectivity or impersonality in the making of decisions—will-power, and unattachment to immediate results.

THE FIXING OF RESPONSIBILITY

STATISTICS of the last few years indicate a rapid rise in both adult and juvenile crime. Prisons and reformatories are filled to capacity, so that the task of even housing these wayward individuals has taken on major proportions. Courts of Justice in some cities have backlogs of cases held over for weeks, and even months. Nor is the *physical* incapacity of dealing with this ever-growing menace to society the chief of our sociological dilemmas. The first and most perplexing problem, according to penal authorities, is *the fixing of responsibility,* the tracing of effects to causes—to know where, or in whom, the guilt is to be found, so that reform may be undertaken.

Neither modern science or sectarian religion, under whose tutelage present-day sociologists have been reared, provide effective help toward solution of the problem. On the contrary, the scientific theory of heredity and environment and the religious dogma of a personal Creator, by whose will alone the disposition of creatures has been decreed, only make for confusion worse confounded. One sociological writer asks how it is possible to frame laws and ordinances that will relieve the evil-doer of responsibility for sins due to heredity, or to weaknesses endowed by God, without relieving him of responsibility.

The simplest definition of the theory of heredity perhaps is to say that it describes the transmission of traits and characteristics from parents to progeny, an aspect of the universal law of evolution. By the slow and orderly process of growth (by gradual change, transformation, and adaptation) everything that exists has *become* what it is in the course of ages. And who can deny that children do carry forward, in either the physical, mental, or emotional departments of their being, at least something of the traits and characteristics of their forebears? Where is the person who has not observed the striking family resemblances, the unmistakable likenesses of manner, that almost invariably exist between parents and their offspring? Even the ideas and beliefs of one generation are carried forward into the minds and aspirations of the next.

In the minds of many people, the one disquieting factor to heredity is that it fails to explain the *divergencies* of character between parent and child with the same ease that it explains *similarities.* For it is well

known that the children of a family, all having traits that are common to the whole, also possess qualities and characteristics which are peculiar to each one from birth. How account for these divergencies on the basis of heredity? Unrealistic supporters of the doctrine offer the rebuttal that if it were possible to look far enough back in the individual's line of heredity, the grandsire of every strength or weakness, of each and every whim or peculiarity, would undoubtedly be found —an idea which, to say the least, is suppositional.

The religious approach to the fixing of responsibility is equally hazardous and unsatisfactory. Both Christian and Jewish belief with respect to the origin of Man and Nature is that the Universe, with everything in it, is the *creation* of an extra-cosmic Deity. The whole of man's inner and outer being—with whatever it possesses of good or evil disposition—is said to be the image and the handiwork of God. The saint, no less than the idiot, destitute of mind and reason from the time of birth, is held to be the production of an all-wise Creator whose ways are beyond finding out—a dogma which leads the inquiring mind into the same dead-end street of logic as that of the theory of heredity. If it is indeed true that the nature and disposition of human beings are determined by either heredity or the arbitrary Will of an outside Creator, then where does responsibility belong? Logic can but declare that it belongs elsewhere than upon the shoulders of the "creature."

Such is the predicament in which the authorities of the day find themselves placed: believing in heredity, or else in creation by a personal God (possibly both), and yet punishing offenders on the basis of individual responsibility for crimes committed!

The ancient evolutionists, on the other hand, were far too wise and too all-seeing in their day to allow themselves to be drawn into positions of either inconsistency or injustice. They approached the problem from the point of view of the threefold constitution of man—body, soul, and spirit, as taught by St. Paul. The body, they held, corresponds to the Earth, and is material in nature, lasting for a period of time determined by the physical, physiological, and psychical laws which govern the race in any particular era. The soul, or spiritual body, corresponding to the Sun, is composed of varying degrees of cosmic substance, states of matter not yet discovered by scientists, though suspected by some. The human soul's period of duration is one which relates therefore to cosmic time, or to the Solar System as a whole, and

embraces billions upon billions of years, humanly speaking. This soul, or spiritual form, focusing a ray of the eternal Atma (Spirit), is the Real Man, the Thinker, who incarnates periodically into bodies of earthly matter. It is the presence of this immortal Ego in man, according to H. P. Blavatsky, which furnishes the *key* to all psychological mysteries.

The first assumption of the Wisdom Religion on the subject of Man is, then, that he was never *created* by an extra-cosmic God, nor is he merely the product of physical evolution or heredity. The material body, it is true, has been evolved during the ages, like any other physical thing, and carries forward from generation to generation the physical, psychic, and emotional traits and characteristics of the whole human race. But the real character of man, his innate knowledge and wisdom, is not thus transmitted from parent to child, but belongs exclusively to the Soul within. These higher spiritual powers and capacities represent the summation or essence of experiences gained through countless incarnations upon earth, and are brought into birth directly by the Soul itself, which comes, according to Wordsworth:

> Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory.

The Reincarnating Ego, though pure and unblemished in its essential nature, is not quite omniscient, nor entirely free—according to ancient wisdom. For it is checked by, and responsible for, the Karma of all its past choices and deeds. When time for incarnation arrives, each Ego is drawn irresistibly toward the nation and family whose physical, psychic, intellectual, and moral dispositions most nearly accord with his own. It gravitates toward the environment which provides appropriate fields of experience, where it may either eliminate defects and thus blaze new trails of glory, or else fail of its mission by falling under the sway of acquired tendencies—which it will be, of course, depending upon the Ego's own Will, determination, choice.

The next assumption of the philosophy is that this immortal Ego in man, this god of dignity and power, is directly responsible for his every thought, word and deed. It is of no use to complain that under this doctrine the environment in which one lives is conducive to sin, nor that traits inherited from one's ancestors show a positive disposition to crime. For these very inner and outer conditionings are them-

selves inevitable and just rewards and punishments, the exact fruitions of the Soul's own thoughts and acts in other lives. He has added his share to his line of heredity, for better or for worse. And no theory, save this of the immortal Ego in man, can restore the human being to his rightful place of *Creator* in the universe, and make him the responsible, dignified being he inwardly knows himself to be.

The question asked by Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?" has reverberated through the ages. Shall it be answered only in terms of negatives? Does the doctrine of individual responsibility lead to the conclusion, after all, that the human soul is accountable only for its *own* bad Karma and misfortune, that each shall labor for his private salvation alone, leaving the devil to take the hindmost? Never a more pernicious doctrine was propounded by the human mind! Race Karma and national Karma influence each unit of the human family through what may be called the Law of Distribution, so that the welfare of every living soul is bound up inextricably in the fortune or misfortune of every other. It is an aspect of the Law of the unity of all life and the Universal Brotherhood of Souls. This Law decrees that men shall work for the whole and not only for self, and that instead of striving for mere personal freedom or gain they shall strive to take upon themselves an ever-increasing measure of the world's Karma. A sense of responsibility is the awakener.

The great body of humanity has been likened to a garden, sown with seeds of the most glorious potentialities, yet overgrown in this age with poisonous, unproductive weeds. The Souls incarnating on earth are the gardeners who knew, before leaving their spiritual estate, both the plan and the purpose of it all, as well as the difficulties to be encountered.

In the eyes of Soul, heredity therefore is not the *cause* of juvenile delinquency or crime. It is only the *means* whereby the Reincarnating Egos find their temporarily appropriate places. Nor is society, environment, or any other outside power or condition the actual *cause* of any man's undoing. It is true, of course, that all these external factors and conditions sway the soul, and for this, everyone who had a hand in making civilization what it is contributes to the downfall of his fellows, and must someday bear his share of the responsibility. But no one *makes* another man sin. No being, force, or power, however high, can *make* any self-conscious unit do anything.

THE GATE OF BALANCE

THE idea of "standing alone" is a familiar one to the student of the occult side of Theosophy. There is a natural tendency, however, to think of it in somewhat heroic terms; actually, since the qualities of achievement are usually presented in great scriptures in heroic terms, their everyday instances may be difficult to recognize, and so also the "ordeals" of discipleship, which, in these days, might be better called the "strain" of learning impersonality.

The capacity for standing alone, "unaffected," for example, might easily be tested first through the suffering of indignity. A simple corollary of the quality of self-reliance is self-respect, and one of the uses of indignity may be to bring on a revelation of how inadequate are the grounds on which one's self-respect is based. To be "respected" is a cherished delight of the personality, yet there may be times when genuine self-respect will give way, because the respect of others is anxiously pursued.

There are two reasons for concern in what "others may think"—a worthy and an unworthy reason. In fact, this seems a rather common rule—that two opposing motives may account, either singly or in confusing blend, for a whole range of human actions. That this is so, throws an illuminating light on the idea that "motive is all," for in all these cases, motive *is* all, and the question of right knowledge versus right motive is not at issue.

Here, perhaps, in the inner analysis of one's motives, lies the ultimate struggle against the genuine materialism in human nature, for it is a kind of materialism, always, which seems to justify a bit or even a large amount of dishonesty or hypocrisy. Ordinarily, dishonesty is a tendency which shows itself in relation to others, and is seldom recognized as playing a part in the relation of a man to himself. Yet self-deception, or the mistaking of a poor motive for a good one, may well be the worst dishonesty of all, if only because it is so difficult to uproot.

In interpersonal relations, the dishonesty that is practiced often comes to the surface in no long time, so that a kind of external pressure —a form of self-esteem—may be the principle cause for self-watchfulness. Too often, however, one is led to think that if no one else can see dishonesty in us, it simply is not there. This, alas, is materialism, for it represents greater honor to appearances than to the inner reality.

Quite apart from one's "goodness" or "badness" in respect to this subtle moral relationship is the bearing of inner integrity on the general influence of the individual upon others. The man who gives primary attention to his motives, and only secondary attention to appearances, and who endeavors to reconcile even his concern for appearances with an impersonal purpose, begins to develop a kind of *power*—the power intimated by Patanjali in the verse: "When veracity is complete, the Yogee becomes the focus for the Karma resulting from all works, good or bad."

The difference between a so-called "inanimate" object and a living organism, however low in the scale, is at once felt by human perception. The presence of living intelligence bears its own impact, a clear differentiation from the mineral kingdom. So, also, the difference between animal and human intelligence is immediately perceptible. To look into the eyes of a dog brings a very different feeling from that which arises from looking into the eyes of a human being. We "feel" the nature of the higher intelligence in the human. Thus, also, may be felt the integrity of the individual who has made even a partial success of the practice of inner honesty, for this individual has gained some working knowledge of spiritual reality and has begun to practice the art of living on the plane of motive—the plane of causes, in egoic existence.

How does one persuade himself to live at this level? Here, doubtless, is the first requirement—to realize that persuasion of this sort can come from no one else, no outside influence. This, fundamentally, *is* self-respect.

What are the tests? The psychic situations which one finds intolerable may well be clues to his inner condition. How does he react to ridicule? How far will he go to escape it? Is he reluctant to inquire into *why* he fears ridicule, as a measure of where habitual attitudes toward self have led him?

Then there is the case of the "successful man." Most people like to be regarded as successful. But suppose, in the case of a number of successful men, each one lost the respect of his community, which now began to regard him as a complete failure, even though these men had in fact lost none of the qualities which had gained them either the substance or the reputation of success. How many of them would lose their self-confidence because they had lost the confidence of the community? How many, in other words, counted their success in the currency of others' opinions?

In groups where ancient truths are honored and pursued, a kind of esteem often accrues to those who seem to enjoy the possession of wisdom, or at least the learning sometimes thought to be wisdom. Even here is to be found a kind of "convention" of knowledge, as is the case wherever there are human beings who are less than completely honest with themselves. Is there a pain which comes from being thought more "ignorant" than the rest? A shame from being discovered in blatant disregard of what are accounted first principles?

Pain and shame may be the only means of discipline to the personal man—the only discipline, that is, available on a personal basis. But this is the *exoteric* basis—the rule of "cultures" and "societies" and "customs." There may be pain upon pain and shame upon shame for the one who realizes that he has fled from these personal penalties with greater fear than from the searchings of his own conscience. The "social conscience" may have an important role in the general development of civilization, in the psychic conditionings which play a part in the external order of human relationships, but the Theosophist has chosen a subtler order of instruction: "The Theosophist who desires to enter upon occultism takes some of Nature's privileges into his own hands by that very wish, and soon discovers that experiences come to him with double-quick rapidity. His business then is to recognize that he is under a—to him—new and swifter law of development, and to snatch at the lessons that come to him."

A student of Theosophy, one may say, ought to put his best foot forward, and this is well enough, since even a well-kept lawn may be an outward mark of inward grace, but the chain of reasoning is of some importance here. Putting one's best foot forward may be in behalf of oneself or of one's party, and it would be a great confusion of moral issues to make one's personal success or achievement to be somehow a "party" issue. For however grand our conception of the work in which we have joined, it is not the labor of a party, even though we may call it a "movement." The ends of Theosophical endeavor are first and ultimately the refinement and regeneration of human nature, and this, in occult terms, means the power of integrity—for here, and here alone, resides the self-existent energy that is needed to awaken the race to reliance on the Self. Nothing, then, ought to be done for its "effect," unless there has first been thorough questioning of motive and the clear determination that there is a far better reason for doing it in principle, before the matter of "effect" is considered at all.

For, sooner or later, there must come to every man and movement that moment of stark depersonalization, when all the conventional supports, all the personal self-justifications and extenuations will be stripped away, and the injunction, "Hold fast to that which has neither substance nor existence" becomes the simple law of survival. It is then that we will look back on our questionings of the personal basis of action with well-nigh infinite gratitude, and bless the hours spent in slowly liberating ourselves from those small hypocrisies and tender solicitudes which fear and dependence press upon us in the name of self-respect.

GAMUT OF PRINCIPLES

In the normal or natural state, the sensations are transmitted from the lowest physical to the highest spiritual body, the faculties of each body having to awaken the faculties of the next higher one to transmit the message in succession, until they reach the last, when, having received the impression, the latter (the spiritual soul) sends it back in an inverse order to the body. Hence, the faculties of some of the "bodies" (we use this word for want of a better term) being less developed, they fail to transmit correctly to the highest principle, and thus also fail to produce the right impression upon the physical senses, as a telegram may have started for the place of its destination faultless, and have been bungled up and misinterpreted by the telegraph operator at some intermediate station.

This is why some people, otherwise endowed with great intellectual powers and perceptive faculties, are often utterly unable to appreciate —say, the beauties of nature, or some particular moral quality; as however perfect their physical intellect—unless the original, material or rough physical impression conveyed has passed in a circuit through the sieve of every "principle" and every "sieve" is in good order—the spiritual perception will always be imperfect. The Yogi who, by a constant training and incessant watchfulness, keeps his septenary instrument in good tune and whose spirit has obtained a perfect control over all, can, at will, and by paralyzing the functions of the 4 intermediate principles, communicate from body to spirit and *vice versa*—direct.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

ON THE LOOKOUT

Veganism, a Philosophical Concept

Lookout for February, commenting on an editorial in the *Vegetarian News,* remarked that "there is a considerable amount of evidence to suggest that 'abstainers from flesh' have gained, rather than lost, in philosophic balance since *The Key to Theosophy* was written." A recent special issue of the *Vegan,* official organ of the Vegan Society (published in Surrey, England, and now in its ninth volume), shows further evidence of this trend.

"Veganism" is a term coined, apparently, in order to suggest an underlying *philosophy,* in a way that "vegetarianism" does not: comparatively few vegetarians are vegans, though all vegans are vegetarians. Mr. John Heron, editor of *Vegan,* explains:

> For those who happen to be reading this journal for the first time, may we say that veganism is the doctrine that man should live without exploiting animals. In a deeper sense this implies a condemnation of man's perversion of the life-force flowing through certain species of the animal kingdom. He breeds animals not only to kill them and consume their carcasses; but also extensively and thoughtlessly to exploit their sex functions (e.g., of the cow and the hen) thereby to supply himself with large quantities of—ideally—unnecessary animal products.

Mr. Heron discusses various changes that would be necessary if "truly humane poultry and dairy farming were to be inaugurated," considers some of the results, then continues:

> It is from the start a wrong relationship, however we try to handle it. . . . There is no consideration with respect to what is really advantageous for the development of the animals concerned. . . . Our responsibility to other aspects of planetary evolution is to encourage them to find their own highest level of expression, not to warp and digress them to meet our own demands. These demands themselves can only meet with the highest suspicion. Is there not an element of ignobility, a taint of degradation in supposing that we can construct the living temple of the indwelling spirit with substances that are derived from a capricious meddling with the sexual activities of animals? The whole purpose of physical generation, in any species, animal or human, is to produce higher and nobler forms. I suggest that man will not attain his full stature, either physically or spiritually, until he has endeavored to assist the universal application of this principle.

THE LADDER OF BEING

> What is the correct relationship between man and animals? The key to a comprehensive answer lies, I would suggest—and here I am going to obtrude aspects of a personal occult philosophy—in the fact that there are two different types of consciousness evolving upon this planet: the human and the non-human. The human consciousness grows through the experience of physical incarnation and subsequently on more interior and emancipated planes of being. By the non-human consciousness, I refer to those spiritual beings, called in some schools the devas, whose unfoldment proceeds, perhaps, through the creation of, and control over, the different species of plant and animal life. They develop their consciousness through the elaboration of organic forms on the physical plane. I cannot enter here into the more intricate implications of the interactions of these two lines of evolution except to say, of course, that mutual co-operation must be the basis for the successful unfoldment of planetary life in all its aspects. If we assist high nature spirits in the production of nobler and more perfect organic forms, we further their evolution and they build up an increasingly elevating world for us to inhabit, with a commensurate effect upon our own consciousness.

"HELP NATURE, AND WORK ON WITH HER"

The foregoing indicates that the vegan is not thinking *first* of his health or physical well-being, though he expects this as a natural result, but feels closely linked to the lower kingdoms as an "elder brother" whose responsibility inheres in the mutual relationship. Mr. Heron evidently feels this sense of oneness deeply, for he is "convinced that until we have recovered the 'lost mythology of nature,' until we forewarn the spirit of the tree that we wish to cut down, until indeed we pay full respect to the existence of the vast and unseen sphere of life whose development takes place before our eyes . . . we shall not enter fully into our inheritance as 'gardeners of the planet'." Mr. Heron expresses man's obligation to the lower kingdoms as follows:

> In animals life manifests in a pattern of behavior through movement *as well as* in the creation of an organic form. Only where it has unrestricted movement in its natural milieu can a given species fully express its innate behaviour-pattern. This is because the behaviour-pattern is designed, so to speak, to interact closely with the full range of factors found in nature. And this suggests that man's first responsibility to the devas concerned with the animal kingdom is to provide parks and wildlife preserves where they may go about their work of unfolding animal behaviour-patterns unmolested. . . . In the light

of a true knowledge of the manner of devic activity man can assist the evolution of the animal species by such things as a discreet control over ecological factors, and the wise management of the balance of the species, and, no doubt, by various other means. There is no interference here with the behaviour-pattern of the species, but only the introduction of subtle modifications into the total area, or park. . . .

Deepest Aspect of Animal and Man Relationship

There was probably a time in past cycles, Mr. Heron says, when man's "greater at-one-ness with nature" may have permitted cooperation between man and animals whereby animals provided food, clothing, and dairy-products in return for food and protection. Under present conditions, however, this is not possible, "for 'co-operation' is, in fact, 'exploitation'." Yet veganism is not a mere sentimental consideration for animals, but a basic philosophy familiar to Theosophists, as the following shows:

I come now to the deepest aspect of the animal-man relationship: that subtle and profound interaction on the level of qualities which reveals a fundamental key to the manner in which man in the most interior way can assist the appearance of higher forms, can augment the influence of those animals with desirable behaviour-patterns and decrease the influence of those with undesirable attributes.

Animals represent the various higher and lower aspects of mankind spread out in symbolic form upon the face of the earth. They constitute, so to speak, a mobile card-index of human behaviour. They are the diversified objectification of qualities that mankind itself is manifesting. The correlation may not in all instances be obvious, but broadly speaking the imaginative will perceive its validity. In displaying the qualities that they represent, such as swiftness, courage, industry, strength, docility, peacefulness, in a pure, untampered way, animals create a living, magnetic envelope, a psychic sphere surrounding the planet that provides a vital force of great value to us in our daily lives. This is not a particularly difficult conception if we think of the flat and tepid condition of a world devoid of animal life. Animals, so to speak, radiate an ambience of volatile and natural enthusiasm that conditions our own response to life.

Man Sets the Tone

But the return current is doubtlessly more powerful. If man radiates true compassion and all noble qualities; if he ceases to radiate the ill-effects of his predatory and nefarious habits, there will tend to be a corresponding amelioration of affairs among animals; higher forms will tend to appear, those that live by tooth and claw will tend to die out. Indeed, I venture to suggest, so profound is the working

power of this symbolic relationship, that when man totally desists from his present war-like and carnivorous habits, the carnivorous and similar animals will have been removed from the earth by a discreet and subtle interaction of natural forces. The *modus operandi* of the relationship is probably not only by direct cause and effect on the level of qualities, but also by a parallel reaction of both mankind and the animal kingdom to higher forces of inspirations acting on each.

MAN, THE CREATOR

Veganism, then, is a way of life based on an aspect of occult philosophy which Theosophists generally do not bring into such sharp relief. H. P. Blavatsky, however, stressed man's kinship—indeed, his identity—with the lower kingdoms, and left it to each individual to discover how he might adapt his life toward helping "our younger brothers." The following passages are suggestive:

As the Soul of the World permeates the whole Cosmos, even beasts must have in them something divine. If there is a developed immortal spirit in man, it must be in everything else, at least in a latent or germinal state, and it can only be a question of time for each of these germs to become fully developed. (*Isis Unveiled.*)

Man was the store-house, so to speak, of *all the seeds of life* for this Round, vegetable and animal alike. . . . "The human shape, in one ring (?), as I imagine, becomes cast-off clothes in the next; it is then appropriated by the highest order in the servant kingdom below."

If the idea is what we understand it to mean . . . then it is the correct esoteric teaching. Having appeared at the very beginning, and at the head of sentient and conscious life, man . . . became the living and animal UNIT, from which the "cast-off clothes" determined the shape of every life and animal in this Round.

Thus, he "created" for ages the insects, reptiles, birds, and animals, unconsciously to himself, from the remains and relics from the Third and Fourth Rounds. (*The Secret Doctrine.*)

TOO MUCH IMPERSONALITY?

An editorial in *Psychiatry* for May offers provocative counterpoint to the familiar stress upon impersonality in theosophic study—suggesting, once again, that it is *possible* to lose the essentials of any virtue by making a fetish of its formal practice. In her final editorial, prefaced by the announcement of her resignation as Managing Editor, Helen Swick Perry surveys transitions in the use of "the personal pronoun" during her tenure. It is natural that psychiatrists should seek the impersonal, or, as they more commonly put it, the "objective" approach,

since the success of individual psychotherapy may depend upon the vigilance with which the practitioner remembers that he must serve as an *agent* in the process of recovery, rather than as a minor deity. On the other hand, social psychologists have given a good deal of attention of late to trends summarized in David Riesman's *Lonely Crowd* and *Individualism Reconsidered*: this is the age in which the individual is easily submerged in vast, routinized, social, economic, and political patterns. So, in passing, Helen Perry notes that "one of the largest departments in the Federal Government has recently issued a memorandum, signed by its head, which asks all employees of that department to avoid the use of the 'perpendicular pronoun.' Nowhere in the memorandum does the pronoun itself—the frightening 'I'—appear."

The Basic Virtue is Honesty

Mrs. Perry turns to a little "personal" reminiscence on the "impersonality" striven for by the editors of *Psychiatry*:

> Like all technical journals, *Psychiatry* has its own little eccentricities about style. When I first came to the Journal, I found that the Journal avoids the use of "we" unless carefully specified; at first it seemed a peculiar rule for a journal so interpersonally oriented. In an early memorandum from the original publications committee, there is the following notation: "Finally, do not use 'we,' 'our,' and 'us,' editorially or otherwise. It is thoroughly discouraged in scientific literature, often profoundly puzzling, and generally erroneous. The use of 'I' is considered good form." This rule was somewhat modified during the time I was on the Journal. An author must, however, specify his use of *we* within his given paper; and he cannot have more than one use for *we* within the paper. He cannot, for instance, use a slippery "we" which slithers around in the course of one paper to mean "we psychiatrists," and then "we in the culture," or "we who have advanced thoughts on penology." Early in my correspondence with authors about manuscripts, I discovered that most authors felt that the use of "I" was immodest. Only gradually did I begin to understand that the use of "I" is usually preëminently modest. A psychiatrist writing of his experience at a hospital may report, "It is believed that the hospital generally operates in such a way as to insure the patients' comfort." Who believes it? If the author is pinned down, he often decides to withdraw the statement; he is not sure that he believes just that, and he is reluctant to say that somebody else believes just that. Perhaps it is a generalized fear of our age lest one find oneself out on a limb.

While the editors of THEOSOPHY may continue to feel that a strict application of "the impersonal-pronoun rule" best fits the editorial needs served by this publication, the foregoing observations are certainly worth noting.

DO ANTIBIOTICS CAUSE CANCER?

An item in the New York *Herald-Tribune,* Aug. 31, lends support to a common theosophical opinion that potent drugs, injected into the human bloodstream, are dangerous, since natural chemical relationships may easily be deranged, thus causing a more serious condition than that revealed by the original symptoms. Drs. B. A. Meyer and J. B. Benjafield (British cancer researchers) have remarked that "antibiotics such as sulfanilamide and penicillin may cause cancer." The report continues:

> Cancer of the lung alone has increased tenfold in England since antibiotics were introduced here twenty years ago. This is perhaps more than strange coincidence, [for] by damaging tissues in some subtle manner antibiotics may inhibit the body's normal immunological reaction to cancer. Wonder drugs also may upset the bacteria-virus balance and so predispose tissues to invasion by cancer cells.

Referring to "recent British statistics [which] show city dwellers are much more prone to develop lung cancer than those living in rural areas," the doctors ask:

> Is it not true that town dwellers have better facilities for medical treatment and that since antibiotics have come into vogue they are freely given? In rural areas, owing to the shortage of medical personnel, antibiotics are given much less freely.
>
> If research proves us right, then a more scientific use of antibiotics should be advocated and the addition of an anti-virus agent would be of enormous value.

COMPLEX MORPHOLOGY OF CANCER

The British doctors are, of course, reporting on lung cancer only. But that the cancer problem is exceedingly complex may be seen from the following resumé (*Journal* of the American Medical Association, July 30, 1955) of an article by T. B. Dunn, M.D., "Morphology and Cure of Cancer":

> Facts regarding the morphology of cancer are discouraging to the hope of a universal cancer cure in the near future. . . . Perhaps the

most important thing we have learned in 50 years of cancer research is the complexity of the problem. . . . It looks now as if each form of cancer, and perhaps each case of cancer, may require individual treatment. The victory may be won not by a single decisive battle, but by a series of successful minor engagements.

Immunity to Cancer—a Navajo Secret

"The white man's attempt to learn the great secret of the Navajo," says the Arizona *Republic,* July 31, "virtual immunity to cancer, may be a step closer today as teams of specialists pack their stethoscopes, crate medical equipment, and bundle their records after a two-month operation on the vast wind-raked reservation in Northern Arizona."

Although American Cancer Society statistics show that one out of four persons throughout the nation will contract "malignancies," there is a conspicuous lack of cancer among Indians. Dr. Clarence G. Salsbury, head of the state department of health (Arizona), who is "convinced that nutrition is a prime factor," brought the Navajo cancer immunity to the attention of the U.S. Public Health Service—which thereupon assigned Dr. William Darby, nutritional expert of Vanderbilt University, to direct the study on the reservation.

Science Probes for Answer

According to the *Republic*:

> Lack of cancer among North American Indians has been known for some time and the 75,000 Navajo comprise an ideal tribe to check because of geographical isolation on 25,000 square miles, but the federal health agency wanted reports other than from the Ganado hospital. In 1953 hospital records were checked at Tuba City, Fort Defiance and other spots around the reservation. Of 60,000 admissions, only 208 cases of cancer were shown.
>
> The public health service was convinced. It peeled off $20,000 last year to start the field work along Dr. Salsbury's nutritional study lines.
>
> Dr. Salsbury's reason for believing the cancer secret is allied with nutrition is based on the vast difference between the Navajo's traditional diet and the white man's. The Indians' diet is heavy in protein. They use poorly refined flour. They eat herbs, roots, and almost the entire animal—usually sheep—except for the lungs, hoofs, and hair. Corn is one of their staples. It is ground on metates, allowing use of the entire corn.
>
> "No one," the doctor says, "knows how much damage is done whites by the refining of flour, corn and sugar."

METHOD OF STUDY

> Onto the reservation this summer moved Dr. Darby, Dr. William McGanity, also of Vanderbilt, and Dr. Hugh Smith of Tucson who was with the Rockefeller Foundation for many years and participated in many similar studies. Dr. Harold Sandstad, head of nutrition for the U.S.P.H.S., also helped with the field work.
>
> Two teams were formed, one to examine Indians in the Ganado vicinity where the Navajo has a more advanced diet and living standard and the other based at Pinon in a comparatively remote area where living is more primitive and the diet more traditional. . . .
>
> Samples of the native food are being taken off the reservation for analyzing by U.S.P.H.S. The traditional Navajo diet confounded the nutritionists. Theoretically, and by the white man's standards, no one could survive on it.

"What we'll find from compilation of this summer's file cards," Dr. Salsbury says, "or what direction we'll take after this year, we don't know; but it will be a wonderful thing if the Navajo can furnish a clue to solving cancer, second only to heart disease as the leading cause of death."

Preventive medicine, by way of thoughtful study of what "the natural life" constitutes, has long been a Theosophical recommendation.

CLASH FORESEEN BETWEEN RELIGION AND PSYCHOLOGY

The *Mirror-News* (Los Angeles) for Aug. 13 states that according to Harvard clinical psychologist, Dr. H. A. Murray, "the uneasy truce that has existed between religion and psychology for the past few years may soon end." Dr. Murray continues:

> Religion and psychology, which are now living together in a state of peaceful co-existence, are both concerned with the nature and transformation of human feelings.
>
> But there may be trouble in the offing when each comes to realize the implications of the other's philosophies and discoveries.

RELIGION MUST CHANGE ITS OUTLOOK

According to the press account, Dr. Murray asserted that "Christianity more than any other religion has consistently 'persecuted the sciences,' and must change its thinking in some respects before it can be compatible with science." He specifies:

> Religion must realize that creative evolution has the power to construct new coherent forms in nature, in contrast to the idea of ortho-

dox religion that creation is caused by a transcendental power entering into the world.

The theory of creative evolution holds that the evolutionary processes are often so slow that men have been unable to record them, believing to be permanent and stable what is actually in flux.

Two other points of conflict between science and organized religion are the several evidences of the pathological prejudice toward women in the Hebraic-Christian tradition, and the notion of an infallible God or church held by orthodox religion in contrast to the insistence of science that infallibility is impossible in nature.

Traditional vs. "Popular" Religion

Meanwhile many religionists are looking askance at certain aspects of a supposed synthesis between "psychology" and religion, as exemplified in Dr. Norman Vincent Peale's *The Power of Positive Thinking*. The controversy has grown so strong in recent months that *Redbook* assigned two reporters to interview churchmen and theologians, publishing the arguments, pro and con, in its September issue. William Peters, writing on "The Case Against Easy Religion," says:

> More and more during recent months, leaders of the Protestant churches have been openly expressing grave concern over the kind of religion being practiced and preached increasingly in the United States. They are frankly worried about the large number of Americans who have been attracted to what has been called "a selfish religion of easy answers."

Meaning Behind the Attack

Mr. Peters talked with "outstanding Protestant leaders," finding that there "is widespread concern that Christianity is being corrupted by the 'peace of mind' approach." Of the fact that "Dr. Peale's name seems to predominate when this subject is under discussion in religious circles," Mr. Peters says:

> At first glance, it might appear that this attack on Dr. Peale's preaching is based on nothing more than "sour grapes"—a jealousy of his success on the part of less celebrated ministers. But the critics are for the most part theologians of impressive reputation, men who are secure in their positions and whose sincerity on this point is obvious.
>
> Instead, it is because Norman Vincent Peale seems to be reaching millions of Americans with a message these Protestant leaders question that he has become the principal target of criticism.
>
> His message is essentially a simple one. He, himself, has said that when you have heard one of his sermons, you have heard them all.

REASSURANCE LIKE DRUG ADDICTION

Dr. A. Powell Davies, pastor of All Souls' Unitarian Church, Washington, D.C., also emphasizes the psychological effect:

> It has a sort of drug effect on people to be told they need not worry. They keep coming back for more. It keeps their minds on a superficial level and encourages emotional dependency. It is an escape from reality. People under stress tend to do one of two things: seek shelter or respond to harsh reality by a deeper recognition of what they are up against. The people who flock to "peace of mind" preachers are seeking shelter. They don't want to face reality.
>
> When you put this kind of philosophy in a religious context, you cheapen religion and give a completely false concept of Christianity. The good life is just not that easy. There is a tremendous distance between Gethsemane and peace of mind. The kingdom of God was never intended to be a fool's paradise.

THE THEOLOGIANS HAVE A POINT

That the "sin-complex" negativism of Christian churches over many centuries finally leads to mass preference for shallow optimism is perhaps but poetic justice. While the Theosophical student may agree that optimism in regard to the destiny of the soul is better than pessimism, he also will feel wry sympathy for the sincere churchmen who resent the transfer of prayer for attainment of the pure life to attainment of worldly success.

Dr. Reinhold Neibuhr, in criticizing Dr. Peale, insists that Christianity should focus upon "repentance and faith, sin and grace." Further that "the new religion of happiness and positive thinking is the same old heresy; it applies religion to business and personal affairs and embodies the success idea. Instead of trying to subordinate our will to the Divine will, we try to harness Divine power to whatever we want to accomplish."

Most interesting is the fact that neither supporters nor opponents of Dr. Peale believe that man unaided by prayer is capable of aspiring to the Christ Life. A fundamental distortion of Christianity is thus apparent, thrusting itself into view on both sides of the current dispute.